

BS2425
V2

MAR 7 1929

The ITINERARY of JESUS REVIEWED

By ALBERT L. VAIL

Author of

"The Morning Hour of American Baptist Missions"

"Mary Webb and the Mother Society"

etc.

PHILADELPHIA

THE JUDSON PRESS

BOSTON

CHICAGO

LOS ANGELES

KANSAS CITY

SEATTLE

TORONTO

Copyright, 1928, by
THE JUDSON PRESS

Published December, 1928

*Gift of
Charles Mathews*

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

BS2425
.V2

THE ITINERARY OF JESUS REVIEWED

THREE PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS

1. The Primary Source of This Publication

During the last decade of the nineteenth century I gave considerable attention to the Gospels in a study which required close attention to the order of events in the life of Jesus. One result of this was dissatisfaction with the harmony of the Gospels which was then, as it is now, generally accepted by those who are best informed in this field. I was not interested in the harmony as a whole, to which I had never given much attention, but the study then in hand raised questions which ran into the harmonic problem, and which developed a spontaneous dissent from the standard harmony between the baptism of our Lord and his permanent residence in Capernaum or a little later. I was pressed to construct a course of procedure for that period which distinctly departed from the one generally accepted. This would not have disturbed me as much as it did if it had not involved a definite difference in the understanding of the experience of the Master and its involved revelation of him. The recognition of this fundamental disorder led me to scrutinize more closely the text for confirmation of my view and to an attempt to construct a harmony in this limited field which would reveal Jesus correctly in that part of his life. From time to time I set my eye on the record to find the mists clearing away until this process resulted in an article entitled: "The Itinerary of Jesus Soon After His Baptism," which appeared in *The Review and Expositor* of January, 1917.

Subsequently some new light came to me, harmonizing substantially with the earlier publication, with minor additions and a more comprehensive expression of the whole. The present publication is based on the other, with additions chiefly which carry answers to questions suggested but not stated previously and bringing the whole into a more perfect expression of my present understanding. I now believe that the accepted harmony obliterates an important chapter, or page at least, in the biography of Jesus; that of a period of transition from a lower and

NOV 17 1928
LIBRARY
14-00-34

Copyright, 1928, by
THE JUDSON PRESS
Published December, 1928

Gift of
Charles Matthews

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

THE ITINERARY OF JESUS REVIEWED

THREE PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS

1. The Primary Source-of This Publication

During the last decade of the nineteenth century I gave considerable attention to the Gospels in a study which required close attention to the order of events in the life of Jesus. One result of this was dissatisfaction with the harmony of the Gospels which was then, as it is now, generally accepted by those who are best informed in this field. I was not interested in the harmony as a whole, to which I had never given much attention, but the study then in hand raised questions which ran into the harmonic problem, and which developed a spontaneous dissent from the standard harmony between the baptism of our Lord and his permanent residence in Capernaum or a little later. I was pressed to construct a course of procedure for that period which distinctly departed from the one generally accepted. This would not have disturbed me as much as it did if it had not involved a definite difference in the understanding of the experience of the Master and its involved revelation of him. The recognition of this fundamental disorder led me to scrutinize more closely the text for confirmation of my view and to an attempt to construct a harmony in this limited field which would reveal Jesus correctly in that part of his life. From time to time I set my eye on the record to find the mists clearing away until this process resulted in an article entitled: "The Itinerary of Jesus Soon After His Baptism," which appeared in *The Review and Expositor* of January, 1917.

Subsequently some new light came to me, harmonizing substantially with the earlier publication, with minor additions and a more comprehensive expression of the whole. The present publication is based on the other, with additions chiefly which carry answers to questions suggested but not stated previously and bringing the whole into a more perfect expression of my present understanding. I now believe that the accepted harmony obliterates an important chapter, or page at least, in the biography of Jesus; that of a period of transition from a lower and

narrower to a higher and broader one in our Lord's understanding of himself. This obliteration results from placing portions of Luke's text later in the experience of Jesus than was true in fact. This misplacement mars the presentation of his personality, especially in the element of his real humanity and the unfolding of his true human experience as the sinless man, in the period immediately following the temptation. This is the main thing but some minor things preceding and following need to be rectified as preparing the way for the main thing and later illuminating it.

2. Introductory to the Harmony Soon After the Baptism

The chief difficulty in harmonizing here is between Luke and John. The harmonists seek to meet this by taking part of Luke's text in the fourth chapter, verses 14-32, from what appears on the surface as its normal connection, this being plain when Luke is read alone, and transplanting it at the return of Jesus from the south, as recorded by John, after an extended tour through Jerusalem, Judæa, and Samaria.

The wide divergence generally between these two Gospels is recognized by the harmonists but not sufficiently. All understand that Luke's was written before John's, which involves that the former was produced entirely without influence from the latter; while presumably the latter was produced with knowledge of the former and possibly with adjustment to it. Matthew and Mark are slightly involved here, but the main issue is between Luke and John, from the baptism up to the permanent enlistment of the first four disciples.

But still, with the ordinary recognition of differences, we do not seem to be quite ready to scan the contrasts between the third and fourth Gospels, particularly as to their general designs and lines of procedure. The two stand distinctly and widely apart in these two particulars. Only as we view each alone along this line of attention do we get the right pitch of interpretation and harmonizing. Let us do so briefly.

(1) The Third Gospel is distinguished by the blending with unusual distinctness of two elements in Jesus; that is, first, the religious, spiritual life, communion with the Father, and, second, the human fellowship, sympathy with those who suffer in any way and relief for them, joined with an unparalleled manner and method adapted to the multitude. These two blend in Luke's Gospel to make him appear more "democratic" than elsewhere. There-

fore this presentation shows him more in Galilee, especially in the earlier sections of his life. This is aptly and openly manifested in his close attachment to Galilee; for there he found the friends of his youth and the fellowship of his simplicity. Nazareth was his "own country," as characterized several times. How often he had been in Jerusalem or anywhere south of Galilee before his public activity is not known, except of course in his infancy and at twelve years of age; but probably his visits there were usually, if not exclusively, at the Passover and possibly other religious feasts. Almost certainly his southward acquaintance was limited, not only positively but comparatively; that is in comparison with the cities in Galilee, especially on the shores of the sea of that name. He was a country boy, a rural youth, at home in the village amid the hills; but we seem to miss the full view of him if we miss him altogether from the Sea of Galilee, especially in his young manhood. It would not be normal for such a young man as he was to fail to walk the streets of Capernaum and its associated cities and be acquainted in their homes. What he lacked of the city culture of Jerusalem, we may reasonably assume, he made up in those smaller cities, which at the same time were large in comparison with Nazareth. This suggests three things, at least, which were actual in fact. First, his choice of residents of the Galilean cities as his first disciples and associates in service. Second, his disfellowship of the jealous criticism of those cities by the narrow-minded Nazarenes, whose vicious challenge of him at his first evangelistic visit there was based more or less on it. Third, his own early and sweeping condemnation of those same communities because of their deficient response to his words and works. A deep tremor of his sensitiveness toward them, as flouting his early and repeated endeavors for their welfare, may be recognized by the listening ear of any one who sees him as a real man. The way had been naturally and sufficiently prepared for his removal of his home from Nazareth to Capernaum after Nazareth had sought to kill him; also for his recoil from the cities by the sea when they failed to appreciate the great opportunity which he carried first and persistently to them. Later he broke away comparatively from Galilee, for several reasons acting together, and finally concentrated his attention on Jerusalem, there to contend in vain with his nation's rulers, and to die, not in vain, for his country and the world. But in Luke nothing appears of this, in any element of it, previous to his settlement in Capernaum, except in 3: 19, 20, which is a parenthetical glance

toward the imprisonment of John the Baptist, where it is properly attached in the harmony, and where we will meet it in due time.

The democratic disposition of Jesus, contributing toward his large activity in Galilee, conspicuously in miracles of healing with manifestations of human sympathy, as exhibited by Luke, resulted chiefly from the same mind in Luke himself. He was Gentile, Greek, physician, and Pauline in his conceptions of the gospel, as presumably in his personal religious experience. The suggestion is credible that he was led to Christ by Paul from whom he readily received that great missionary's views of the universality of the Christian scheme, then in advance of Jerusalem, including the apostles. Luke among the writers of the Gospels was peculiarly free from predilection toward Jerusalem and temple. From the beginning of his Christian life he faced the Gentile and democratic way which indicated his preference for Galilee and the synagogue. He was peculiarly qualified and constrained to do just what he did beyond all others, that is, to trace the course of Jesus from his birth, through his youth and manhood as a normal sinless man, one with the multitude while one with his Father in heaven. This conception of his Gospel is the keynote for understanding it.

The above gathers emphasis when we consider Luke's intellectual quality in tracing the orderly sequence of events and accuracy in understanding them, as indicating the scientist in the physician; and his capacity in combining exactness and elegance in style, as his Gospel conspicuously reveals. His opening pledge to set things in their order raises the question, What kind of order? Various replies have been proposed which seem to me to be considerably superfluous. They usually gather substantially under two heads, the chronological and the logical or rational or vital. For in this kind of writing, primarily biographical, the order of events in time guides because the other order or orders are involved and largely flow out of the chronological. To get the true meaning of the man we must find him as he grows through consecutive manifestations in the order of time. This is primarily Luke's order of necessity, and in pursuing it he reveals the character of Jesus as a man, any man, with one difference from all other men, in that he was without sin. Undoubtedly Luke gathered much interesting material which he did not use in his Gospel. What he did use was carefully selected and consecutively combined with a fulness and completeness biographically without a parallel. The chronological order is primarily necessary and carries with it all other

pertinent conceptions of "order" as far as they are desirable for his purpose.

(2) John's Gospel pursues the course most distinctly the reverse of Luke's. John introduces the Word of God as with the Father in heaven before Abraham was on earth, before the earth was made, and the One through whom all the worlds were made, being himself God. Thence he descends into human nativity, humiliation, and self-emptying, as the supreme manifestation of God's love for mankind, as the Saviour of men. In this presentation Jesus walks aloof from human associations comparatively and extensively, early ignoring his mother in her misunderstanding of him; and in general pursuing a course of independence of natural associations and sympathies, mystifying those to whom he spoke spiritual truths in physical symbols; and so going on until, near the close of his life, he came into human fellowship in some particulars similar to that in which Luke starts him. That is, Luke starts Jesus at the lowest and reveals him rising to the highest in his growing experience; while John starts him at the highest and leads him to the lowest in the sense which has just been indicated. The point where these two Gospels meet in such way that they blend chronologically may be expected somewhere near the middle of the two; not meaning in textual space but essential conceptions. One result is that Luke holds the attention to Galilee at first; while John at first directs the attention to the realm and temper above human levels while avoiding Galilee and even when in Galilee.

This point could be illustrated in various ways, but we observe only one, prayer. Consider the difference between Luke and John in their revelations of Jesus as praying. Luke more, not only as compared with John but all the other Gospels, reveals Jesus as prayerful, as praying frequently or constantly, sometimes all night when he was very busy during the day; and so relating the prayer times with the proximity of great events and their perplexities, that it is almost certainly related to the course of events in which Jesus was most intimately concerned. Here we have as nowhere else a man conscious of his own limitations in wisdom, knowledge, and power, and conscious also of seeking all these directly and daily and nightly from God. His praying is set in view as peculiarly the praying of a dependent and trusting man.

Now, in contrast with Luke, it may almost be said that John represents Jesus as not praying at all in the greater part of his busy life. Not till he reaches the threshold of his departure does he address God in any way for any-

thing, except thanks for food once. Then, in 11: 41, 42 and 12: 27-30, he speaks to him as Father; but here he distinctly says that this is for the hearing of others, not for himself. In both of these instances he forestalls the natural misunderstanding. Then follows silence in this kind until the seventeenth chapter; where he disavows praying for the world at all, or for his disciples in relation to the world except that they may be kept from its evil, and he confines the praying to the spiritual and eternal. Taken as a whole this prayer has rather the tone of a conversation between equals, in which one expresses his mind to the other on a common interest, with little or no dependence or supplication. And on the cross the three utterances attributed to Jesus by Luke and the three by John can be compared in a similar way with the contrast between the domestic and the physical in John and the others in Luke, which deal with pardon for his murderers from God and salvation for the thief from himself, and his own recovered consciousness of oneness with the Father.

Are these two the same man? Yes. But the two different designs and plans of the two writers cause them at the first sight to be two radically different men. And I venture to say that no one can ever well understand Jesus in one of these Gospels while he reads it as if it were a part of the other. This is often done by the average reader; possibly by a scholarly harmonist. Here we close these preliminary paragraphs with one more to concentrate and emphasize the whole into a word of warning for all.

Whatever may be our speculations concerning the union of Deity and humanity in Jesus; however insurmountable are our difficulties in tracing the course of his growth from infancy to maturity; and however indistinct to us are the order and extent of his realizations of his duplex nature and the resulting self-revelations during the course of his experiences in learning, meditation, and prayer; whatever limitations to our understanding of him appear in this whole field, it seems necessary for us to realize that when he rose from his immersion in the Jordan, and the dove and voice blended to acclaim God's satisfaction with him, at thirty years of age, he was the most perfect man, viewed as genuinely human, who ever trod the earth. He had lived not only in the meditative country but in close contact with the busy cities by the sea, as well as with the perpetual tide of trade and travel along that central cosmopolitan track of it, between Damascus and Egypt and beyond, as he had studied these all for two decades under the guidance of his perfect harmony with God.

THREE PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS

We are therefore not at liberty to think of him as either erratic or morbid, or in any way that discredits him, in our attempt to understand him, and on this understanding to fit together fragments of the Gospels (which were not originally designed for such use) on any other basis than that of his superlative human perfection. This is said not to forestall our judgment with irrelative assumptions; it is to get what forecasting light we can to guide and steady our interpretation of him with his reality.

One impression seeming to me to evolve from these reflections is that of the logical precedence of Luke in the chronological harmonizing of the Third and Fourth Gospels.

As already stated, my attention to this problem began prior to the appearance of a harmony of the Synoptics without the Fourth Gospel, and it has been concluded without recognition of the newer method, which, if accepted, renders useless much of my effort. But now, my respectful attention to and scrutiny of the tripartite harmony results in unhesitating rejection of it, at least for popular use. This is for several reasons, but one of which, however, will be mentioned here.

As far as I have observed the chief reason for eliminating John's Gospel from the harmony appears in the great differences in the style and contents between the three and the one. This difference is great, as I have given my own understanding of it in preceding paragraphs. But what bearing has this on the harmonizing chronologically of the four? Elements of character and order of events in time are so essentially different that they cannot be brought into the same class for comparison. Prove that a man was in a certain place at a given time, and the time point is fixed, whether his speech and action there and then were those of a philosopher or an idiot. With the chronological harmony secured, the student of the character scrutinizes and utilizes whatever is available whether he finds agreements or incompatibilities of whatever grade. The limited portions of the Gospels with which this study is concerned furnish an excellent sample of chronological harmony arising out of distinct variations. Observe this in two connections both of which are on the limited area of the present discussion.

a. Matthew states, next after the baptism of Jesus, that when he heard that John was cast into prison he departed into Galilee, and leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum. How is this related to the baptism? Where was Jesus when he heard of John's imprisonment? When, relatively or absolutely, was John

imprisoned? Other pertinent questions might be raised; but the Synoptics give no light on any of them. Mark agrees with Matthew, except some omissions, but adds nothing. Luke might have furnished at least a suggestion if his reference to the imprisonment (3: 19, 20) had been left where he placed it, but the harmonists remove it to a later date.

b. Next after the rejection at Nazareth the harmony of the Synoptics inserts the call of the four fishermen. Here are introduced by name four men, concerning whom previous to this time the three Gospels are totally silent, but who seem to be well acquainted with Jesus and peculiarly responsive to his desires in them. When and how did they become acquainted with him? How are we to account for this acquaintance or penetrate the mysteries of it? And other pertinent questions may be found, all ending in nothing but confusion and questioning. Here is another great gap.

Now in both of these situations these gaps are filled by the Fourth Gospel, abundantly, accurately, impressively. On what ground of reason or common sense do we ignore this light that shines over and into these tangles of darkness in the other Gospels, clearing the way for firm tread of our understanding? It seems to me more consistent to think that the author (or authors) of the Fourth Gospel designed to provide what was lacking in these connections by the others.

When one has the person and work of Jesus the Christ clearly in mind and thinks on the plane of the New Testament, he can consistently apprehend that the Four Gospels reveal the duplex nature of Jesus more clearly than could have been done, perhaps, by any number of such writings combining to give the portraiture and revelation of him in and through the same general mold of uniformity. Rightly viewed the variations and superficial contradictions are constructive, not confusing. And as concerns authority or trustworthiness they stand for us on precisely the same basis, the basis of their long established recognition by the Christian world as parts of the Scriptures.

THE ITINERARY OF JESUS REVIEWED

The usual itinerary of Jesus in the harmonies of the Gospels, to cover the first thirty-two verses of the fourth chapter of Luke, is this: From the baptism to the temptation; from the temptation to the Jordan, where the first disciples were secured; from the Jordan to Cana, where the first sign was wrought; from Cana to Capernaum, for a few days; from Capernaum to Jerusalem and Judæa; from Judæa to Samaria; from Samaria to Cana, with the healing of the nobleman's son and beginning of the Galilean ministry, including the first rejection at Nazareth.

Instead of the above I propose the following: From the baptism to Nazareth; from Nazareth to the temptation; from the temptation to Galilee, with the beginning of the Master's teaching and working in the synagogues throughout that region, including Nazareth and the first rejection there; from Galilee to the Jordan, where the first disciples were secured; from the Jordan to Cana, Capernaum, Jerusalem, Judæa, Samaria, and Cana again; from Cana to Capernaum, where Luke 4: 32 meets him in the First and Second Gospels.

The usual order gives the precedence to the other Gospels and distributes the text of Luke in order to meet the demands of the others. The itinerary now proposed preserves this section of the Third Gospel intact without disturbing the others. The purposes in this revision are two: First, to vindicate Luke as historian, and second, to reveal Jesus more perfectly as the perfect man, intellectually and spiritually, psychologically and practically, in harmony with his deity acting within its self-appointed limitations.

I

FROM THE BAPTISM TO THE TEMPTATION

(Matthew 4: 1; Mark 1: 12, 13; Luke 4: 1, 2)

Did Jesus go directly and immediately from the baptism to the temptation? According to the harmonists he did; and while the place of the temptation cannot be certainly determined, it seems to be generally understood to have been near the Dead Sea and Jerusalem or in that vicinity. The view here maintained is that he went first to Nazareth and thence to the temptation. The evidence in support of this view is drawn from the Gospels and the psychological probability, that is, that this was the natural course for him to take.

1. What do the Gospels say touching this point? John says nothing, but the Synoptists all say something. Matthew 3: 13 says that Jesus came from Galilee to the Jordan "to be baptized." This is definite as to the region from which he started; but not so definite concerning his course immediately afterward, for the statement is that Jesus was "led up" by the Spirit from the place of the baptism "into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil." To go up from the baptism might mean in almost any direction except down the valley toward the wilderness of Judæa. But when the two statements of Matthew are combined the result is a strong probability that he went toward Galilee from which he had just come. Mark reenforces this, saying that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee to his baptism. Luke completes the record, not by stating the point of departure but that of the return, adding, "and was led by the Spirit in the wilderness forty days tempted by the devil." This may safely be taken as the key to the problem. Luke, who uses language with distinctive accuracy and who has pledged himself to set things in their order, seems to state two separate things, however closely related they may be in time or otherwise. One is that after his baptism Jesus returned, and the other is that after his return he went into the wilderness and was tempted.

The Greek word here rendered "returned" occurs thirty-two times in the New Testament, all of them except three in Luke's writings. Its ground meaning is "to turn round" or "back." As used here and in most other places, it is applied to the movements of people, and means

to turn back to or toward the point of the preceding departure. The insistence seems to be strong, and more, that Luke here accurately means what he says. Unless somewhere is some unmanageable contradiction or modification of his statement, taken in its normal sense, I see no propriety, literary or moral, in imposing on it any other meaning. No difficulty is in sight unless it may appear in Mark 1:12, where after his reference to the baptism, he says, "And straightway the Spirit drives him forth into the wilderness." The difficulty is in the word "straightway" or "immediately," which the harmonists avoid by adjusting Luke to Mark. I prefer to adjust Mark to Luke who seems to me to have right of way on the evidence. Thus we are led to two things.

First, Mark is nothing if not precipitate. In this immediate connection he uses this word "straightway" nine times in twenty verses. This suggests a permissible hint at least in the direction of moderation in the interpretation of it here. Second, this modification is a necessity when the application is to an extended course. It cannot be applied with rigid exactness all the way. Mark 1:28 uses this word in a connection with suggests, if it does not demand, the same freedom of interpretation. It says that a report of Jesus went out straightway, everywhere into all the region of Galilee round about, which seems impracticable literally. In the instance now before us, Mark was intent on the temptation as the next thing to be recorded of those salient things from one to another of which his habit is to skip, ignoring details intervening. We much more reasonably interpret him here in this way than literally. When this is done the difficulty is removed. Mark means that the start to the next thing which he intends to record began immediately; and Luke says that this start was on the return to Nazareth.

The conclusion which we have reached by this scrutiny of the texts is impressively confirmed by pertinent psychological considerations. The way in which Luke states it is the way in which we should naturally expect it because it is the natural way for Jesus to act in that situation, he being preeminently a rational man filled with the holy Spirit. Consider it. The Baptism, with its accompanying inflow of God into his consciousness, doubtless opened suddenly a large and perplexing prospect to him, to which he must give careful consideration. This would grow on him as he reflected until in due time it would so absorb and saturate him, that he would lose appetite for food, and equally for the society of men who could neither understand nor assist him. Then, having carried

out his original intention to return to his home, he would retire into solitude for further meditation and prayer. I submit that about what we have stated is what we reasonably expect him to do at this time. That is just what Luke says he did. He returned to his home, and in a short time he left it again in order to be alone with God, in his intention without expectation of that conflict with Satan into which his meditation led him. This is peculiarly appropriate in Luke, for he gives us, as no other writer does, the human spiritual experience of Jesus, presents him in an unparalleled breadth of Christian exampleship, the clearest and highest exhibition of reasonable, spiritual, serviceable manhood. This Gospel abounds in such disclosures of our Lord; and among these flashes of disclosure none is more profound, more deft, or more true than this: "And Jesus filled with the Spirit, returned from the Jordan; and was led in the Spirit in the wilderness forty days tempted by the devil."

If question appears touching the location of the solitude of the temptation the most reasonable reply seems to me to be that it was in the vicinity of Nazareth, probably northward, possibly extending to the cedars of Lebanon and the dews of Hermon, and ending outside of Galilee. Jesus doubtless was well acquainted with that whole region, more or less familiar with it from his boyhood, and he knew where most easily to find places fitted to his design. This "wilderness" was the same kind as that in which John the Baptist was then preaching. It was not a gruesome region but one uninhabited, solitary, where he could be alone. To me the "wilderness of Judæa," that "horror" beside the Dead Sea, seems distinctly impracticable. It not only contradicts, by distinct implication at least, what the three Gospels say when they are combined, but it makes Jesus pursue a course contrary to normal impulse and rational procedure. Why should he go there when no evidence appears for such course? No indication exists that he had ever been there or had any inclination that way unless it be assumed that his association with his forerunner constitutes or encloses a reason. Such assumption seems to me peculiarly infelicitous. Temperamentally he and John were at antipodes. John was predominantly ascetic and denunciatory; Jesus social and solicitous. The baptism of Jesus was not on the basis of John's essentially, it was distinct and separating. Jesus came from the Jordan distinct from John and superior to him in the thought of both of them. Therefore as John fitly sought, more or less before his public appearance, the rough and howling wilderness of

Judæa, it seems to me that Jesus would prefer for his purpose at this time a place near his home in which he had previously communed with his Father in heaven whom he was now seeking for light on his own coming course in doing the will of God. His mood was calm, balanced, expectant. When Satan appeared he was met calmly, convincingly, conclusively, without a hint of alarm or perturbation; and his responses to the tempter were quick, clean-cut, and conclusive.

II

FROM TEMPTATION TO GALILEE NAZARETH, AND CAPERNAUM (Luke 4: 14-32)

Where did Jesus go first after his temptation? The opinion of the harmonists is that he went to John the Baptist and secured his first disciples. My opinion is that he went to Galilee, for a season of teaching and working, during which his mission appeared more completely to him and with it the need of disciples as assistants in these fields. On what does this opinion rest?

Mark and John furnish no light on this problem. The former says, next after his reference to the temptation, that Jesus returned into Galilee subsequent to the imprisonment of John the Baptist, which was later than the period which we are considering. The latter makes no reference to the temptation, but finds Jesus first among men with John at Jordan and in connection with calling the first disciples. The solution of this problem therefore lies in Matthew and Luke.

Luke's account in this connection is both comprehensive and concise. He here writes like a historian, evidently in the spirit of his introduction, in which he proposed to state things in their order. His story unfolds with the quick step of a clearly defined purpose and an orderly design. No indication of gaps appears in it. Of course it is conceivably capable of adjustment to another narrative if one should distinctly require it, but the opposite quality is so patent that we should respect it until a conclusive reason appears for modifying its surface impression. How does Luke put it?

He states that Jesus, after the completion of every temptation, returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee. And a report went out concerning him through all the surrounding country. And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified by all" (4: 14, 15). If we think of him as having gone to the Jordan directly from the temptation, the word "returned," if it stood alone, would require him to return to Jordan, but Luke adds "into Galilee." Leaving this portion of Luke's text undisturbed in its continuity, we see that Jesus returned from the temptation to Galilee and there began to teach in the synagogues so effectively that he was glorified by all.

This was the perfectly natural course for him to take, it being distinctly harmonious with the whole portraiture of him in this Gospel. As illuminating this view notice the orderly use that Luke makes of terms touching the relation of the Son and the holy Spirit.¹ At the baptism he says that Jesus was full of the holy Spirit. This is a general term for the abundance of the Spirit without indication of the purpose of it. The apparent purpose then was to prepare Jesus for the solution of the unfolding problems following the baptism, and meeting the impending temptations, enabling him to stand and withstand against Satan. But after the temptation he returned "in the power of the Spirit." The power of the Spirit implies the recipient's enduement with him for the work at hand, in this instance the service of the Messiahship, for which Jesus was not authorized until he had won that triumph. The next normal thing for him to do was to begin to deliver the message committed to him. The natural place for him to begin was where he was best acquainted and with the most favorable conditions. He is now intent on using his new power in the service to which he is called, and he begins where on the whole the conditions are the most favorable to success. His thought now is not of disciples to be trained for service. His time had not come for a theological seminary or a missionary organization. The understanding that he returned immediately from the temptation to the Jordan for the purpose revealed in John's Gospel is, in my opinion, psychologically defective and a spiritual anachronism; for at that date he was naturally dominated by the desire to tell out effectively what had come into him personally and intensely, not to John but to the people whom he knew in Galilee. Such is the normal order in the experience of men usually, of which his experience was designed to be typical as far as compatible with the differences between him and them. Therefore when he felt this inflow of the power of the Spirit, the normal course for him was to go to the people most accessible and presumably responsive and apply the power to them. This is precisely what Luke said that he did. The complete statement, which appears a little later, carries marvelous deeds and superior speech, delivering the distressed and delighting the people. In these two things chiefly the meaning of that power appears. Details here were designedly left by Luke till a little later.

¹ My writing "holy Spirit" in this connection and similar ones is to avoid the confusion of the two periods, before and after Pentecost. The "Holy Spirit," personal, was not given till Pentecost and the "holy Spirit" of the preceding period can be distinguished in this way.

This primary campaign was probably brief. He was thinking rapidly as well as widely and not much time was needed for him to reach several conclusions. The first was that a hard way awaited him, and perhaps also that it would soon end in his death, as "the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world." Second, that he must muster and train others to perpetuate his work after his departure. Third, that this training of others should be mingled with his own wide proclamation of his mission and authority. He may have planned definitely his tour southward as John records it, to Jerusalem, Judæa, Samaria, the logical order, the strategic procedure. Harmoniously with what John wrote later, I confidently assume that Jesus did not stumble into this course. He went into it with the finest intelligence, as Luke knew about it, as Matthew and Mark and others did, when Luke wrote, but it did not need to be written for Theophilus or others. One omission by Luke here, however, should not be overlooked but should be seriously pondered. It is that during this period in Galilee, including Nazareth, as Luke has it, Jesus was active entirely alone; not a disciple, not a companion of any kind is recognized anywhere. How can this omission be explained if this section of Luke's record is transferred to the later period to which the harmonists remove it, and where Jesus always had companions? But keeping it where Luke attaches it, it fits exactly into the Galilean period prior to the visit to John.

Perhaps at this point we are justified in more conspicuously stating, what has been involved all along, that Luke wrote throughout the earlier portions of his Gospel with the purpose to treat the Lord's course in Galilee as a unit. He rigorously excludes everything outside of Galilee after the baptism, and selecting incidents and utterances adapted to his purpose he combines them on his own plan. As long then, as he does not dip over the Galilean boundary for anything else, it is almost demonstrated that he does not dip over in the fourth chapter. This statement is not contradicted, but seems to be confirmed, by his writing, in 3:19, 20, where John's imprisonment is mentioned out of its chronological order. Why? Because he wishes to record it as closing the Fore-runner's service introducing Jesus; but not intending to say anything about events south of Galilee, except the baptism, he places the reference to the imprisonment of John before the baptism, thus clearing the way for adherence to his general plan without omitting that additional item about John. Harmonious with this is the fact that in his single subsequent mention of John, replying to the

inquiry sent from the prison, Jesus mentions neither the imprisonment nor the death of his faithful forerunner. This is logical and skilful if Luke intended to carry his writing straight on independently throughout this earlier period of the ministry in Galilee. If he had had a purpose warranting the rupture of his text at 4:14, it seems incredible that he should have introduced such a striking chronological confusion into his record, in the face of his pledge to put things in their order. But if he was writing as I am assuming, he was perfectly, eminently consistent throughout in this connection.

Let us get our bearings as arising out of all that has gone before. In the light of all of it we seem to be fairly constrained to set our compass here under the guidance of Luke, unless this is prevented by modification from some other source, which does not appear up to this point in the generally accepted harmony. Thus we get firm standing-ground for the continuance of the view hitherto maintained. What have we seen? First, Jesus growing in all human elements in his whole life normally. Second, his baptism bringing divine announcement of harmony between God and him on the basis of his sinlessness and consecration in righteousness, but nothing about power. Third, the temptation bringing power. For what and in what relations? All relations with men pertinent to his mission among them, are easily reducible to three general and permanent: First, in speech, as teacher and preacher; second, in the control of nature in the elements and the physical life of humanity; third, over the antagonistic forces of the invisible world of spirits, commanding and ejecting demons enthroned in the human physical. In all this course he has advanced along normal lines of growth, deliberately, cumulatively, as a real, growing, human being, but without sin, which fundamental exception sufficiently answers any doubts that may arise in any mind in this connection. All this leads to the question: Is it probable that this perfect man will go immediately from the triumph over Satan to John the Baptist, of which no Scripture gives a glint, or to Galilee, as Luke states with extraordinary distinctness? Here was an advanced consciousness of God, the natural impulse of which was toward Galilee, while before going to John he presumably would desire to test this impulse by a review of the situation. Bringing him first to John seems to me to do violence to his normal procedure, while to Galilee at once is impressively admissible and at least probable.

The significance of the readiness of the harmonists to slight the order of Luke in these preliminary sections of

the mature life of Jesus, is at once promptly perplexing while prospectively pertinent. It is perplexing when coming from his friends after the criticisms of his enemies have been so silenced as they have. But the prospective consideration comes partly at least to the solution of this problem. These preceding discredits prepare the way for those more serious ones which follow. The so-called "first miracle of Christ" at Cana looms as demanding the displacement of the order of Luke, which order moves on smoothly and impressively when it is taken alone. We will soon proceed to an endeavor to remove the Cana barrier which has long stood in the way of just treatment of Luke in the harmony.

III

JOHN THE BAPTIST HAS TWO NOTABLE VISITORS

Having observed Jesus through his first tour in Galilee, as far as Nazareth at least, and return thence to Capernaum, as Luke alone reports him, we follow him out of Galilee to the camp of John the Baptist, as recorded in the Fourth Gospel. Here Luke omits what John inserts, not because Luke did not know of it but because the plan of his writing excluded it. Jesus had not visited John since the baptism because he had had no reason for doing so. But the Master's open mind, illuminated as he proceeded "in the power of the Spirit" to proclaim himself as the promised deliverer, had meantime received additional impressions concerning his future course, which now gave him two reasons for going to John: First, to complete John's testimony to Jesus; second, to procure among John's disciples prospective pupils and associates for the strenuous work which now opened to him. The immediate urge on this line was the approaching Passover which Jesus must visit in the prosecution of his great enterprise. So we come to the two notable visitors to John the Baptist.

1. (1:19-28.) The first visitor was a deputation from the Pharisees in Jerusalem, bringing a more than usually impressive communication, not in its substance but in its source. The people had been coming with inquiries about the status and claims of the stirring prophet beyond the Jordan; but here was a committee of priests and Levites from the Pharisees in Jerusalem who hitherto had not attached themselves to John even to this extent. John's reply to these investigators was the same that he had often said, that he himself was only introducing the Greater One. But he added a few words of special significance to us in our investigation. He announced that the Supreme One was then there, standing among the people but not known to them. These two arrivals, at the same time, substantially if not immediately, constitute a fact of thrilling significance, on which, however, we cannot linger. Those gentlemen from Jerusalem disappear, but they leave Jesus standing there.

2. (1:29-31.) The next day as Jesus was approaching John announced him as "the Lamb of God that takes

away the sin of the world," who was also "the Son of God." He had said previously that the coming One would baptize in the holy Spirit and would make a much cleaner sweep of demands for reformation on ethical grounds than his forerunner had; but he had not referred to him as a lamb, which to the Hebrew mind involved sacrifice for sin, and this now for the whole world. John here announced a much finer and higher and more vital understanding than he had previously uttered, at least clearly. Where did he get it? We are not told, and in my opinion we do not need to be told. Jesus quite certainly had received this from his Father while in Galilee he had been announcing himself as the promised One, for Gentiles as well as Jews, and he had now told John what had come to him as he went about doing good in the "power of the Spirit" since his baptism. When John got this he was delighted to proclaim it; and when he learned from the same source that Jesus was looking for young men to become later permanently attached to himself as learners and fellow workers, preferably those who had been through a preparatory course with John, he gladly helped in executing this purpose.

A question naturally arises here involving a challenge of the course which we are following; namely, in view of the wide-spread stir in Galilee caused by the initial campaign of Jesus there, how are we to account for the evident ignorance concerning it among John's disciples? This question and challenge seem to me to be easily and satisfactorily answered by a little reflection and observation. The period of this preliminary publicity of Jesus had been brief, perhaps very brief. The ordinary means for spreading report of it was by word of mouth by men on foot. No indication up to this point appears that any one had crossed Gennesaret or Jordan. The natural understanding on this basis seems to be that probably the report was confined to Galilee, though not necessarily so. But notice further that Luke's phrase in 4:14, "all the surrounding country," seems to be reasonably restricted to Galilee, since he does not here say or intimate anything beyond, and because also he continues this silence after this point. Moreover this probability is strengthened by Luke and Mark combined where they are united in the harmony; for after the call of the four fisherman, Luke says: "and there went forth a rumor concerning him into every place of the region round about." Standing alone this might with some reason be understood as reaching beyond Galilee; but Mark, in the same connection (1:28), has it, "everywhere into all the region of Galilee round about."

This limitation at the later date cautions, if it does not command, against the wider interpretation in the earlier statement of Luke. And in addition is the very reasonable assumption that no suggestion would come to Luke of misunderstanding by any one at this point at any time. He was writing with the limitation of his meaning within the boundaries of Galilee so distinctly that he saw no need to guard the reader against the error of extending his limitation into regions round about in the sense of beyond the limits of Galilee.

IV

THE LORD'S FIRST GREAT SOUTHERN TOUR

(John 2:1 to 4:42)

This period, from the camp of John the Baptist to the departure from Samaria, does not signify much for our investigation except slightly as a sidelight. As such its contents need to be kept in view preparatory to turning the light on the text covering the passage from Samaria into Galilee.

From the vicinity of John the Lord led his newly acquired disciples into Galilee, in response to an invitation to a wedding in Cana. This event takes its significance for us entirely from the sign of the water made into wine, and the chief significance now is in its showing the wide difference in the points of view of Luke and John. The former deals almost exclusively in works of humanitarian quality, closely associated with extraordinary prayerfulness in the solitary night. The latter sweeps a range of operations distinctly and greatly above the other, in the fields of the life which came down from heaven, the spiritual things as isolating Jesus from the common man, and without any recognition of prayer in him. The sole purpose for our use of this Cana sign appears in the closing sentence of the story about it. This purpose was to confirm the faith of the disciples in Jesus as it had been avowed before their journey began and lifting it into an additional if not a higher realm. Apparently no one else was present except the servants who did what Jesus told them to do, with no knowledge or care about it; and presumably Mary who certainly cared whether she knew or not. But to the disciples it came as a new revelation of Jesus, in or near the creative realm, higher substantially than healing disease, controlling the elements, commanding demons, or even raising the dead, for all of these may be more easily challenged on natural grounds. In it he showed forth the glory of himself. He wrought no other wonder in Galilee at that time, lingering there only a few days; when, with his disciples and perhaps his mother, he started to the Passover. Here we leave this sign until prepared to examine it more fully in connection with the second sign in Cana. In Jerusalem he assumed control of the temple, or its administration in some elements, and cleared it of abuses which were quite certainly well known

to him previously as he had observed the increase of them at various visits there from year to year.

After passing out of Jerusalem into adjacent parts of Judæa, he continued his manifestations of wisdom and power, details of which are not recorded, but which drew to him greater crowds than followed John the Baptist, until his departure to Judæa through Samaria. Various translations of John 4:4 indicate some kind of necessity for him to go through Samaria. This imperative certainly was not physical. He could easily have gone around it, as seems to have been the custom of some Jews in order to avoid the disagreeable Samaritans as well as to express their own bigoted detestation of them. This necessity was in his own mind and probably in his prearranged plan of this evangelistic tour, to close in Samaria. All the way he was proclaiming himself as the promised Messiah, for whom the Samaritans were watching with conceptions more or less the same as those of the Jews. With these preliminary observations we concentrate our attention on the problem of harmony.

V

THE CLIMAX AND ITS CONFUSIONS

At or near the border between Samaria and Galilee the climax of confusions for us now appears. Some of its elements reach back to Judæa and are minor in value or in pertinent significance. Others are major, more completely in Galilee and of more consequence on the main issue. These intertwine more or less, but we will try to see them straight.

1. The Minor Items, of Which Two Appear

(1) What induced Jesus to leave Judæa when he did? Matthew (4:12), next after his report of the temptation, resumes with the statement, "when Jesus heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee, and leaving Nazareth he came and dwelt in Capernaum." This seems to mean that the imprisonment of John influenced the course of Jesus, and that he then changed his residence from Nazareth to Capernaum; but here as elsewhere Matthew closely connects items in time which elsewhere are shown to have been separated more or less. If this statement had such aspects of compactness, continuity, and accuracy in details as have Luke's statements in this vicinity, it might fairly raise a difficulty in harmonizing; but appearing in this Gospel it may be taken as a general, condensed statement, correct in its elements but not significant in its details. That is, Matthew means that the retirement of Jesus from Judæa occurred at or near the same time as the removal of his home from Nazareth to Capernaum. More light on this may appear later.

John (4:1-5) touches this field with an explanation which, while at first sight it might appear different, yet on closer attention seems to come to the same thing. He says, "When the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John . . . he left Judæa and started again into Galilee." However this may be viewed, it is minor, and perhaps may be left without additional attention.

(2) Reference comes into view of a change in the substance of the Master's preaching in that "at that time he began to preach and to say, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 4:17). "That time" may be understood either as when he started from Judæa into

Galilee, or after his arrival in Capernaum, as his home. In either interpretation, the item is interesting and may be significant in relation to what is to follow. Mark 1:14, 15 agrees with Matthew. The meaning here must be not that Jesus then began to preach but that in his preaching he began to mention repentance. Attention to the record, especially in John, reveals that previously the preaching of Jesus had taken a wide range, in Galilee, Judæa, and Samaria, clustering around his central theme of himself as the promised One, but without repentance anywhere. What does this mean?

On the plan of the harmonists I find no resting-place, but on my plan something impressive appears. The harmonists place the return correctly in relation to repentance, but bring in the rejection at Nazareth still later. They attach the general statement in Luke 4:14, 15, in connection with the same in the other Gospels, seeming to overlook the fact that Luke there differs from the others in its silence about repentance. But that silence indicates that those two verses in Luke belong in the earlier period as my scheme provides. Jesus was not preaching repentance when he went to Nazareth the first time; he was preaching repentance when he moved out from Capernaum as his home on his first preaching tour after his return from the south. When he went to Nazareth the first time, which was before he returned to John after the temptation, he was not preaching repentance; and when this distinction is ignored another violence is done to the text of Luke.

We hardly need to linger in Samaria but may well impress on ourselves the remarkable difference between the record of Samaria and elsewhere. At Sychar no demand or request for a sign is reported and no physical miracle was wrought. Was none such needed there? Possibly some such may have been done but not reported. However that may be, the great wonder work there was that one appearing in the woman and the community responsive to the announcement of himself as the Messiah. In contrast with many Jews, those Samaritans accepted him in the higher meanings without challenge at any point. The greatest open success of his life in his efforts for spiritual results was among those watchers for the Messiah on their heterodox basis. His popularity there, in both quantity and quality was without a parallel in any other community as a whole. One bearing of this on a connection not yet reached in this study may justify this reference to it. (To anticipate in a single sentence: the faith of the Samaritans without outer evidence acted powerfully by

contrast with the doubt and demand of others to intensify the aversion of Jesus toward the sign-seekers among his own people.)

2. The Major Items, of Which Three Appear

John 4:43-45. "Now after two days he departed thence and went into Galilee; for Jesus himself testified that a prophet has no honor in his own country. Then when he was come into Galilee, the Galileans received him, having seen all the things that he did in Jerusalem; for they also went to the feast."

(1) Take the two sentences of this quotation, view them as united and, when so united, as a unit detached from what precedes and follows them, and what do we have? A puzzle. What do they mean? What connection have his going into Galilee and being welcomed there by the Galileans, with his saying that a prophet has no honor in his own country? The connecting word "for" evidently signifies that the second part explains the first. But how? It has been suggested that something which would fill this gap has been lost out of the text; but it does not seem necessary or advisable to adopt this precarious assumption. The better course appears to be to hold that something lies under or beyond these words which explains them as they stand. Jesus somewhere said this in a connection which furnishes the explanation. Where had he said it previously? The only instance on record is in the Nazareth address; which was earlier than this as I understand, though later as the harmonists understand. In that address it appears as introductory to the riot which closed that meeting. It is conceivable that John here may have had in mind this saying later than the connection in which he places it, possibly at the second visit to Nazareth, which, however, neither John nor Luke mentions. But this seems not probable. And if we keep Luke's order intact, this quotation from Jesus on a previous occasion fits precisely. It seems to me to fit almost necessarily in its contrast between the rejecting Nazarenes and the welcoming Galileans, and impressively right where John wrote it. In order to get more adequately this view of it consider what follows.

Taking these words as having been uttered in Nazareth previously they stand forth as the expression of a great experience in the soul of Jesus as he faced that crisis. It was not a passing remark by the way. It was the outrushing expression of the deep wound in his sensitive spirit in contact with what he saw to be at hand; the treachery of Nazareth, voicing its illegitimate de-

mand, not only toward him personally, as neighbor and friend who had grown in favor with God and men as he had lived among them for thirty years; but against him in the character which he was distinctly claiming for himself; and more yet, against his Father and the God of Israel. If Jesus at that hour spoke in a calm voice and with a placid manner, he did so in his unique self-mastery, the same that stayed their murderous hands from killing him. If John, with some such understanding, refers here to that saying in Nazareth, his confirmation of the view maintained by me stands out emphatically. And for him to have so written here with his exalted conception of Jesus seems to me to have been entirely normal.

(2) Another point in this connection seems to demand consideration. It relates to the reference to Capernaum by the Nazarenes in their explosion against Jesus at his first visit there as a proclaimer of himself. Placing the Nazarene incident where Luke places it, this reference is exactly correct. Jesus had just come from Capernaum, or substantially so. They had heard of what he had been doing there, and they required that he furnish them the same evidences of his standing which had impressed Capernaum. But shift this event down to where the harmonists place it, and the mob's demand is changed to an anachronism of serious proportions, in this way. When Jesus entered Galilee, near Nazareth, the Galileans resident there "received him gladly," in consequence of the wonderful things he had done in Jerusalem, not Capernaum. By that time his fame had spread throughout Galilee and beyond. Nazareth of course had heard it as it came from Jerusalem and vicinity. Consequently the demand of the Nazarenes would be based on what they had heard as having been done in Jerusalem, not Capernaum. The demand is the same as in the earlier instance, but the basis of it should be Jerusalem, not Capernaum. Place the visit to Nazareth before he went south, and the appeal to the works in Capernaum is perfectly pertinent; but place it afterward, and before he went to Capernaum on his return from the south, and next after the second sign in Cana, only a few miles from Nazareth (all of which is according to the harmonists), and the result is so unreasonable that it may be declared almost impossible.

(3) Concentrate attention next on the third major item, appearing here out of the silence in which we have previously left it, that significant phrase, "in the power of the Spirit." What has become of it? In my view it is the central, significant link between the temptation and Capernaum, without any intervening connective, this soli-

tude emphasizing its significance. Where has it gone, according to the harmonists? They inform us that it has gone into two different connections. One of these places it in Judæa earlier than the departure of Jesus from that province into Samaria or simultaneous with it. In that connection the harmonists place a fragment of it, part of the fourteenth verse of the fourth chapter of Luke, while the remainder of that verse is placed after the entrance into Galilee and before the second sign in Cana; this entry repeating the fragment previously used and adding verse fifteen. Next in the harmony comes the second sign in Cana, followed immediately by the Nazarene passage, Luke 4:16-31. This jumbled mistreatment of Luke's straightforward, compact, and clear statement, "Then Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee, and there went out a fame of him throughout all that region, and he taught in their synagogues, being glorified by all. And he came to Nazareth"—this confusion seems to demand further attention in our effort to get at the real situation at the threshold of the second sign in Cana.

What significance attaches to the elision of this phrase, "in the power of the Spirit" in the fourth chapter of Luke, immediately after the temptation, and restoring it in Judæa, as Jesus was starting on his return to Galilee from his southern tour, which had occupied several months, and of which Luke gives neither statement nor intimation? This phrase, which appears nowhere else in the Gospels in application to Jesus, seems to me to carry on its face a clear signal of its deep significance, which grows deeper as one reflects on it in the light of his whole life. Where is it more significant, fitting, necessary; where Luke places it or where the harmonists place it? It seems to me to have not only preferable, but commanding and essential meaning next after the triumph of Jesus over Satan, once for all, as the central result of the immaculate fidelity of the tempted One. He is now empowered in the Spirit as never before. At his baptism he was filled with the Spirit, expressive of his Father's appreciation of him as the beloved Son, but not for power. The dove symbolizes peace not power. This experience of power must wait till after the temptation, and soon after because the recipient of it cannot proceed without it. Luke's quickly stepping rhetoric is here true to itself. He is marshaling the central epochs in the growing life of Jesus as the sinless man in their normal order. He has written of him in his birth, his growth, his youth in the temple, his young manhood in waiting, in his testing at the temptation; and now, with the swift and accurate

stroke of his facile pen, he announces him in his equipment with the Spirit in power adapted to the work assigned him as he carries the power of God to do the will of God, wherever and in whatever way that will may require, over the bodies and souls of men. It is the clarion proclamation, keynote, of his whole subsequent life blending fidelity and efficiency. Is it possible to find any reputable reason for uprooting it out of its normal connection and transplanting it down in Judæa? I can see no specific reason for it there; no such reason for it anywhere except where Luke places it. Anywhere else it is rationally, psychologically, and spiritually a misfit.

If I were asked to fit a caption over this statement in Luke, "And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee," to express in a borrowed term the significance of it, I would say, "The Pentecost of Jesus." Here he experienced that which was paralleled approximately by the Pentecost in Jerusalem as nowhere else. Up to this time no evidence appears that he had any power over nature and people, such as followed immediately and continued permanently throughout his life in the flesh. So the disciples, waiting in Jerusalem, received power, "the Holy Spirit coming on them" as never before, enabling them to work wonders in the natural world, as a transient testimony, and their successors in the spiritual world instrumentally, to the end of the age. As they went out into Jerusalem and beyond, he went into Galilee and beyond. The significance of this experience of Jesus is in its being initiative, persistent, and continuous to the end of his life in the world of humanity, as the same for his people is in the age of the redemptive revelation. If the arrangement of the harmonists here is accepted, it then seems to me that with corresponding consistency we might place the coming of the Holy Spirit on the disciples after Peter's preaching had stirred the whole city.

Before proceeding to the next section, which deals with the two signs in Cana, it may be helpful to summarize briefly some of the points so far appearing in order to get the cumulative impression adequately with which to proceed into the field toward which we have been moving.

1. Recall the rude treatment of Luke's significant word "return." First, the harmonists discard it in the connection in which Luke, when viewed in the light of Matthew and Mark, clearly intends it to be taken. Then, later, when Jesus starts to return from Judæa, they tack it on; thus making him appear as skipping the intervening time, in the style of Matthew and Mark, for which no warrant

appears, in this vicinity at least. Here they reverse themselves, in that where they threw it out previously, they now force it in, with no reason, as far as I can see, except the necessity of getting it in somewhere. (This versatility of the harmonists is interesting.)

2. They sometimes place the temptation in the wilderness of Judæa, when by the whole effect of the indications in Matthew and Mark, as well as the presumably normal movement of Jesus, it should be in the opposite direction.

3. They reject Luke's pivotal phrase, "in the power of the Spirit," where he places it, and restore it, perhaps six months later, where it has no specific significance, thus depleting or devitalizing it.

4. Making Jesus go from Cana by necessary implication, after the second sign there, to Nazareth, and reporting the Nazarenes as saying at that time "Capernaum," when they should say "Jerusalem" or "Judæa."

These elements of discord, with their discredit of Luke as historian, seem to result from the assumed necessity to recognize the first sign at Cana as the first miracle. The earlier rendering, "This beginning of miracles," applicable to the first sign in Cana, has misled a multitude of readers. The change from "miracle" to "sign" and from "beginning" to "first," now appearing in improved translations puts a new face on that statement; and, as I seek to show, may be so used legitimately as to remove Cana as an insurmountable difficulty, or any difficulty, in harmonizing chronologically; thus leaving Luke's text to stand intact in the connection in which he places it.

VI

THE TWO SIGNS AT CANA

The second sign at Cana now appears later in the chronological order, but attached directly and distinctly to the first one; so that the two are sometimes properly viewed jointly, and now especially as they raise questions or challenge concerning the interpretation advocated in what has gone before in this discussion. The central question which they bring is this: All other considerations aside, how is this criticism of the current harmony to be maintained in the light of John's statement about the priority of the first Cana sign in his Gospel, 2: 11 and 4: 54?

In order to approach this problem properly we need to recall that there are two Greek words in the Gospels which are loosely translated "miracle" in the King James version and some others. One of these is based in the idea of power, dynamic, such as may seem to require divine action perhaps, in this sense "miraculous." The other word is based in the idea of evidence or proof of the supernatural actor. This word in the Fourth Gospel takes the place of the preceding one in the other Gospels. The aim and the output here are not in the power itself but in the significance of it as pointing beyond. Applied to Jesus, in response to his claim for himself, the demand or request was repeatedly met that he do mighty works to prove his claim. So we come to the consideration of the two signs in Cana. Recalling our previous interpretation of the first one, we are now to inspect them as united in such extraordinary way that to disregard the particulars of this union is to misunderstand them when not so related, for the obvious parallels between them indicate a kinship so unique that any candid mind must be impressed by it as demanding some special recognition. The material falls into four sections directly, with a fifth to be attached indirectly.

1. Both Signs in Cana of Galilee

This place is not mentioned again in the New Testament except as the home of Nathanael. (John 21:2.) The identity of it in the first mention of it is repeated (John 2: 1 and 2: 11), a duplication for which no reason seems to appear unless it points to some significant peculiarity in the event, or the two combined, which should not

be overlooked by the seeker of the meaning of what is recorded in Cana of Galilee. Also the reference to the second sign in Cana, as being in the same place as the first, seems to be equally superfluous or more so, that is, "where the water was made wine." It might appear to be a reflection on the intelligence of the reader to insert this clause, for certainly no intelligent and attentive reader could fail to understand that this Cana was the same as that of the water-wine wonder; and the less intelligent and attentive could not fail as he read to see the identity of the two Canas. Why then stands here this seemingly superfluous item in any ordinary view of it? If it does not mean a reiteration of the propriety of very careful attention to this double Cana signboard, let him who can find some other explanation of it, do so. An additional reason for attention here may be in the word "again" in the closing sentence of the statement of the second sign in Cana, which seems superfluous. To justify it we may venture to give it extraordinary significance to the effect that it is intended to emphasize the close connection and association of these two events. If this is correct it requires us to concentrate our attention as it suggests. One popular modern version omits it, possibly because of failure to grasp its significance.

2. The Parties Concerned in the Signs

Consider the two parties for whom the two signs were wrought primarily, though of course for the instruction of others ultimately.

(1) *The Disciples*. (John 2:11.) They were just stepping over the threshold of prominence in their association with Jesus and as important factors in our understanding of him. They had just been transferred, temporarily and intermittently, from the school of the forerunner of the Lord to that of the matchless Master himself. They did not much, if at all, understand their own significance in this relation; but John did when he wrote his Gospel. This instructive, unprecedented, and unduplicated work was for their benefit. They met it face to face for all the meaning that they could get out of it and this meeting was abrupt, unheralded. They were not placed on their guard or in any way touched by any intimation of it. This testing of them was subtle and searching.

(2) *The Nobleman*. (John 4:46-54). What this title, as it comes to us in the King James version of the Bible, means is not quite clear. It is variously rendered in modern versions, as "courtier," "king's officer," "a royal official," "a man well born," and possibly in other and

more or less indefinite terms. The Greek is a "kingly word," implying or involving royal relations of some kind. The assumption seems to be safe that this man had some relation to the Roman government that distinguished him among men, somewhat as we now use the word "honorable" as a title. And this carries the pertinent suggestion that he was a Gentile. If so, his significance in this connection is enhanced, because he then may fairly be viewed as in some measure standing for the world-wide design of the Lord, thus completing in some sense John's descending revelation of Jesus. But personally and immediately he came with the single purpose to get the help of the famous healer in saving the life of his son which now seemed to him as otherwise lost. He had started from Capernaum to Cana as soon as he learned that Jesus had returned from Judæa into Galilee. He may have acquired his strong faith in this healer through reports that had reached him of remarkable achievements in this field; or he may have witnessed such works before the healer had gone south. If we let Luke say what he says in his fourth chapter, this man had probably had opportunity in Capernaum to see the success of Jesus in cases like the one now in his own family. This seems to me to be the most consistent understanding of the origin of the faith which he had when he stood before the Master with his urgent plea.

The eager and hopeful application of this officer was met by a rebuff which might well startle the reader of the record of it, as it might have discouraged the applicant if his faith had been less firm than it was. The Lord here seems almost to blurt out the aversion toward sign-seekers that had then become fixed in his mind. He had been assailed, perhaps much more than the record shows, by the foolish or crafty sign-seekers in his southern tour; and now he answers this anxious man with words that might seem to imply that he was of that foolish and crafty crowd. This applicant presumably had no knowledge that Jesus could heal without the proximity of the sufferer; the records up to this time show none such: but instantly he rose in his unshaken faith and met this surprising challenge with, "Come down before my child dies." He had no time and no mind to discuss sign-seeking. He was not seeking a sign for his faith but a salvation for his boy. When Jesus saw this faith, or possibly called out the expression of it, he replied, "Go thy way; thy son lives," or "will live."

In order to understand the remarkable greeting given to the "nobleman" by Jesus it is necessary to get the best

possible understanding of the mind of the Master at that moment as to sign-seekers and rejectors. At least an approximation to it is not difficult, especially if Luke's order is preserved. Jesus encountered an extended procession of those offensive critics, beginning with Nazareth and continuing in Jerusalem and Judæa. He had been relieved of them in Samaria and in the first Galileans met by him after he had crossed the border between Samaria and Galilee. He was now at Cana, near Nazareth, where he might naturally have gone if he had not been outraged there. It was his own country, his home, but it had cast him out. The concentration of all these lines of conflicting memory, reflection, and purpose centered in him to make him alert toward sign-seekers and rigorous in his treatment of them. And the earlier Nazareth experience focalized all the others.

3. The Results Following from the Two Signs

(1) *The Disciples.* They "believed on him." If this stood alone it might be understood to mean that previously they had not believed but now began to believe. But evidently this cannot be the meaning. This saying says more than it says literally and limitedly. Its meaning must be that they believed in some kind or degree beyond what they had believed earlier. What was it? They had shown their faith in him as Messiah, Master, and Redeemer. What they saw in the words "the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world" may not be clear all the way of our belief now, but as far as they understood they accepted him as the promised One, not only on the assurance of John the Baptist but also on the impression received by them from him directly. But now the revelation rises into the realm of the creative, and they saw in him more than had appeared to them previously. Herein faith was laid for them on a deeper and firmer foundation and rose to a higher and clearer vision; beneath which was nothing deeper, higher than which was nothing higher. Here now is the first appearance of a sign designed to be such and done for the purpose which appeared in the immediate and great result.

(2) *For the man the same or similar process and result are reported* in the statement that "he believed and his whole house." When he started homeward from Cana he went with faith in the veracity and power of Jesus, whether with little or much thought of the might or mystery of the power which could go by wireless without losing any of its efficiency. But when he and his people had compared notes and dates and had thus settled be-

yond doubt that Jesus could not only do what was implied in his closing assurance but could do it instantaneously, then a surge of deep, sweeping, and uplifting faith filled him and his whole family. Here is a second sign designed, at least presumably so, to operate on the faith of a man who while a Gentile was also a believer, although not an enlisted disciple.

4. The Gradation of the Two Signs in Cana

(1) The first of the two is the higher of them, and the highest essentially of all the wonders under whatever title which Jesus wrought throughout his life in the flesh. I do not think of anything which he could have done, working in the familiar elements of the material world within their knowledge, that would have appeared to them more creative than to produce in a moment by his unspoken will the change of water into wine, which requires considerable time and transmutating processes in the course of nature. In symbol could he have said more plainly, "I am that Word of God through whom the world was made"? To this time John has not descended a particle, in any discoverable instance, from the high plane on which his revelation of God through Jesus began. But now he brings that exalted life and power down into the material, in contact with the earthly life of men, and in this realm he works through it. We need not be surprised that some discriminating minds maintain that this first sign automatically asserts itself as restricted chronologically to the Gospel in which it appears, leaving no need to search any further as we are searching now. But others are not so discriminating, and we are adjusting our argument to them.

(2) The second step downward was taken in the same place, Cana, also in connection with a believer, more limited in his field of faith but responsive as far as he knew, though without any purpose of discipleship official or functional, immediately or remotely. The field of operation here is that of human physical need, such as appears throughout the Gospels most constantly and completely. Through these two steps of sign-working Jesus descends in John's Gospel from heaven to earth practically and sympathetically. Except in the indefinite statement that the Lord was made flesh and dwelt among us, John has not intimated human experience and manifestation of the Word of God; but now these are incorporated, and however high John's vision of Jesus in this writing may remain, this condensation will be carried concurrently and securely. This means much for our understanding of John's portraiture, which, however, will con-

tinue long on a plane so high relatively that to many Jesus will seem impracticable, incomprehensible, either demonized or insane or insincere—all this to such extent that at one reported juncture his extreme spiritualizing will cause the permanent departure from his school of many who will never return.

The remaining item to be noticed is that in Matthew 4:12-16, which places it between the temptation and the calling of the four fishermen. The harmonists place it between the Nazareth rejection and the calling of the four. But removing the Nazareth item from this date to an earlier one, as I do, we find the harmonists agreeing with Matthew; that is, placing it between the second Cana event and the four fishermen. To meet this scheme of the harmonists here we must assume that after the second sign in Cana Jesus went to Nazareth and from there to Capernaum, personally and physically. I am quite confident that this is a radical misunderstanding. The interpretation must be removed from the physical to the psychological; that is, he went physically directly from Cana to Capernaum because he had left Nazareth out of his fellowship, no longer regarding it as his home, because it had cast him out. Perhaps Matthew inserts this clause here because the normal course for Jesus otherwise would be to go to Nazareth and thence to Capernaum, as the harmonists assume, which he did not do because he had left it in the sense of abandoning, rejecting, repudiating it. In this way we sometimes use the corresponding English, and it is legitimate here. Our understanding of that Nazareth violence as we have already interpreted it emphasizes this. He did not at this juncture go to Nazareth and then to Capernaum, but leaving Nazareth out he went to Capernaum, having chosen it as his home.

5. Collateral Contributions to the Problem in Hand

We now bring into view material in all the Gospels which may possibly be of value as confirming or correcting what has gone before.

(1) In John's Gospel, in two parts: First, before the second Cana sign and second, after it.

Before the Cana Sign

a. 2:18-22. The clearing out of the pollutions of the temple brought the demand, "What sign showest thou to us, seeing that thou doest these things?" He replied, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." They did not understand this, and he did not expect them to understand. His reply carries an aspect of scorn or

contempt. Here at the outset John represents him as scouting or flouting their protest as unworthy of attention. So obscure was his meaning that his disciples did not understand it until after his resurrection, and John thought explanation of it necessary for the readers of his writing.

b. 2:23-25. When the wonderful things which he did convinced many, he rejected their faith because he knew what was in men, that they and their faith were superficial or otherwise untrustworthy. Here is the same temper as previously, but manifested by silence because he neither sought nor accepted any such recognition as theirs.

c. 3:1-12. Nicodemus appears expressing his faith that God was with Jesus on the basis of the "signs" which he wrought. But Jesus totally ignored this compliment, with its confidence, and began at once to explain the spiritual meaning of his mission, lifting the explanation so high that even this master in Israel could not understand it. This is all that the Fourth Gospel reports of attention to the sign-seekers and sign-trusters from the Sign-worker before the second sign in Cana. This total silence of John for himself or as reporting the words of Jesus, concerning a sign element in the miracles done previous to the second of those at Cana, emphasizes this word "sign" as it stands double-fronted at Cana.

After the Cana Sign

Several instances of the use of "sign" by the people lead the list after the Cana scenes. This was natural for them as recognizing the wonders done as evidence on the claims of the wonder worker.

a. In 9:16 the Pharisees come with the same word, and again in 11:47, 48 they repeat it, supported by the scribes, and this "in council."

b. John himself uses "sign" as applicable to the works of Jesus three times, 6:2; 12:18; 12:37 (rendered "miracle" in the King James version and some others). At first sight this may seem to be out of harmony with his writing and refraining from writing this word in this way. But observe that in all such uses of it he is stating the thought of the people whom he quotes, and so his use is substantially quotation from them. He was mentioning the deeds of Jesus as they understood them, and for their understanding the thought required or at least suggested, the word; and so it came into the text as quotation from them. This view of it seems to me to be consistent with the total absence of the use of "sign" by John throughout his expressions of his own thought and that of Jesus. In our

idiom this might be expressed as "sign," that is, "as you say."

c. John reports Jesus as using "sign" once, but apparently in a way not conflicting with the position taken just above. In 6:26, he was upbraiding the multitude for giving to the food he had miraculously provided for them more attention than to the miracle which he had performed in providing it, which work they recognized as a sign that ought to have led their thoughts higher, giving the word the meaning which they gave it, that is, proof of his claims. Here he did what John did and on the same basis, substantially quoting their thought and using their word as an aid to their understanding of what he was saying.

d. Our inspection of this Gospel will not be complete without observing the way of Jesus in using some other word where he might have used "sign" if he had not been restrained from doing so by a profound reason for his course.

In 10:24-27, the Jews desired him to speak plainly of his claims, to which he replied, "I told you, and you did not believe, because you are not of my sheep. The works that I do in my Father's name bear witness of me." He makes no appeal, but he rebukes twice. First, "I have told you and you did not believe." (If I should tell you again, you would not believe. Your proposal is not sincere.) Second, "I have done works sufficient to prove my claim." (Your seeking works when you have had plenty of them proves that you are tricky.) This was *ad hominem*, turning their own position against them; and the fundamental point is that they were not of his sheep, which explains the whole. The particular point is that he says "works," not "signs." Substantially the same situation with the same result appears in 5:36-38, with the added elements that he goes as far as he does in concession toward them because of his desire to save them. And if desired, add that John reports the wonders done in Jerusalem as "things," not signs.

(2) Leaving now the Fourth Gospel, we turn out attention to the others for light on some points in our observation of it. Following the commonly accepted harmony we find nothing pertinent until after the designation of the apostles except the first visit to Nazareth. The point to be noted here is that the Lord in reading the minds of his critical hearers, said that they demanded of him to do for them whatever he had done in Capernaum. Evidently they thought of those things as signs; but he, while giving their thought, refrained from using the word which probably they would have used.

The second incident, which is liable to be misinterpreted, is that of his reply to the messengers from John the Baptist (Matt. 11:2-19 and Luke 7:18-28): "In that hour he cured many of diseases and plagues and evil spirits; and on many that were blind he bestowed sight," and he said, "The dead are raised up." These things which were done then may have been designed to meet the difficulty of John, though not necessarily so, and for his comfort; but he was not a disciple whose faith needed to be advanced beyond what it had attained previously, therefore this event was in no way in the same class as the Cana signs. John had been the pioneer believer in Jesus, by whom he was lauded as the greatest man up to that time. In prison and depressed toward doubt of his own faith, or understanding, he was consoled by this steadying of it, as fitted his abnormal state as well as the normal and alert sympathy of Jesus.

The third incident in this line is the searching condemnation of Capernaum and its neighbors because they had not responded properly or adequately to the extraordinary evidences given them. (Matt. 11:20-24.) Here Jesus appeals to his works as evidences, but he does not say "signs," nor was his purpose to improve their faith, but to condemn their unbelief. It was another *ad hominem*, taking their point of view to emphasize their guilt.

Next we find something positively and conspicuously pertinent. (Matt. 12:38-42.) Scribes and Pharisees expressed to Jesus their desire to see a sign from him. His reply was as comprehensive as it was incisive. He said: "An evil and adulterous generation seeks a sign; but no sign shall be given it but the sign of Jonah the prophet; for as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the fish, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." And then he contrasted in the judgment that whole generation of rejecters of Him with Nineveh and the queen of the south, because a greater than Jonah and Solomon had been rejected by it. This leaves nothing unsaid, the saying of which is necessary to complete understanding. It sweeps the whole horizon. It utterly cuts out all parley concerning his credentials. The issue of signs in relation to him in his natural life is cancelled and expelled. His resurrection is to be the only sign for the world in that generation; and it abides also for all generations. This is repeated at two dates, in Matthew 16:4 and Luke 11:29-32. Here in this three-fold utterance of this one thing the Master uses "sign" as his own word, the only time recorded of his speech to unbelievers. This is completely consistent with all that

has gone before in this survey. If Jesus said these things in this way and at those times, then this use of this word by him reaches backward, passing all intervening, and allies itself with John's use of it in the two Cana events with a distinctness bearing light on the right interpretation of those two; for here Jesus announced the one only sign as evidence for the world, and there John wrote of the two signs as for believers alone.

Having now finished, however imperfectly, our search for side-lights, as well as straight lights, on the two signs in Cana, let us focalize them in our thought, and in this illumination place on them the interpretation which removes the whole aggregation of confusions which have come into view as we have proceeded. In this we will lift from Luke the discredit which the harmonists place on him as historian in the earlier portions of his Gospel; while he, at the same time, discloses the normal development of Jesus as the sinless man, perfect both in his sinlessness and his humanity. This brings us to the statement that the Cana miracles as signs are unique in their purpose, effects, and relations, when properly interpreted, and therefore stand apart from all other miracles done by Jesus to such extent and in such quality that they constitute a class by themselves, thus being set aside from the chronological tests which might be theirs properly without such specific interpretation.

Previous to the second Cana event John has shown Jesus as utterly ignoring the sign element in his works, which repudiation is continued without exception whenever he is expressing the mind of Jesus or himself; and with this all the other Gospels agree. No parallel and unification appears in any Gospel in the relations between any two miraculous works such as stand out conspicuously in these two. The second one is clearly and strictly second to the first one, which fairly involves that the first one is first to the second one; and neither one of them is designed to be construed as either first or second chronologically in relation to any other. Any number of miracles might have been before the first of these and any number might have been after the second one of them (as we know that many were between them) without disturbing the record of these two with their unparalleled peculiarities of association with each other and differentiation from all others. They are chronologically properly placed in John's plan, as he sets forth the descent of the Word of God from heaven to earth; but their chronological significance ends with them because it is completed in them. That Jesus might have wrought other wonderful works

with the same intentions and results as appear in these is possible; but no record of such appears, and we are not justified in assuming them. The overwhelming testimony of all the Gospels seems to be that the other miracles of Jesus, usually if not invariably, were the expression of his compassionate sympathy and all harmonious qualities of his saving mission on earth. He was the masterly servant and the serving Master all the way. No inkling of indirection or double dealing is apparent anywhere. His good deeds sprang from his love of goodness, revealing the love of God, without being either strengthened or weakened by any ulterior purpose. Incidental effects may be many, no doubt, and within his right when he chooses to use them; but only one, that one in two at Cana, is clearly revealed, or impressively suggested, as in the result certainly, and in the purpose, almost certainly, of the deed.

VII

POSTSCRIPTS

Some suggestions seem to flow from the preceding. These arise chiefly from the items in the Synoptics soon following the final location of Jesus in Capernaum. Three such, at least, occur in this connection, the ejection of a demon, the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, and the call of some disciples into more permanent relations with the Master; mingled with statements of the extension of such favors to many and the great popular interest in consequence of these things. The difficulty comes because Luke implies the call and states the response to it after the miracles, while Matthew and Mark place it before them. These two last are so completely the same that one of them appears to have been copied from the other or both from some earlier source; while Luke's record differs from them in its details so much as to be in its effect partly contradictory. Having cleared the way by getting the first Cana sign out of the way, we might leave the succeeding record to proceed without any attention in this study but we may find some light additional here reflected on what has gone before. Therefore we raise the question: Which text is more reasonably placed first, that of Matthew and Mark, or that of Luke? The harmonists reply, "Matthew and Mark." They could hardly do otherwise consistently in view of what they have been doing up to this point. I venture to disagree with them.

1. Prior Occurrence of the Two Miracles

It seems to me highly probable that the two miracles did precede the enlistment of the four disciples as permanent in personal association with Jesus. Almost certainly they went with him on his southern tour, but so far the larger meaning of their discipleship was not known to them. Therefore they naturally resumed their business, perhaps with his approval, until further instructed. The promptness with which they responded to the call, when it appeared more fully developed to them, suggests that they had some understanding in that direction. If something of this nature was actual it would not be surprising if the impetuous Mark, with his eye on the great movement to some extent, had put the call in first, to be followed by the other items as subsidiary. Luke tends to the other order. Up to this point he has not specified at all in

reporting the works of Jesus in the power of the Spirit to which he had made general reference. The time is now reached when it seems to him to be the next thing due in his writing; therefore he gives several incidents in detail; and even if he knew that the other order was the exactly chronological one, he might insert these items here and bring in the call, which is not in the same class, next following. This, however, does not seem easily credible in the light of the usual methods of the two parties; Luke continues on normal lines, and the others intermittent variously.

2. The Two Records Compared

Any one who looks closely into the three Gospels in their narratives of the separation of the four disciples from their secular business to follow Jesus must see that while Matthew and Mark are sufficiently alike to justify placing them in parallel columns, as referring to the same time, Luke is so very unlike them as to raise a fair question, or a firm affirmation, on this point. Aside from the general scene at the lakeshore where they presumably were often together, Luke differs from the others in every detail. (1) The two, Matthew and Mark, say that Jesus was walking along the shore of the lake, (perhaps alone); the one, Luke, says that he was standing by the lake and speaking to a great multitude. (2) The two say that he first called two of the men from their fishing to go with him; and proceeding further he did the same with the other two at another place, who were also "casting a net," and both pairs responded to the call; the one says that the men of both boats were on the shore and washing their nets. (3) The two say that Jesus called the men from their boats to go with him and they left "their nets" and went; the one says that he, in order to get a better position for speaking to the crowds, asked Peter to put his boat out a little from the shore, and then spoke from that vantage-point. (4) The two say nothing more; the one says that when Jesus had finished speaking, he directed Peter to put out to deeper water and let down his net, which Peter did after protesting what he thought was hopeless. (5) The two continue silent, everybody gone and the scene closed; the one reaches the climax in the amazing success of Peter's effort, and the immense effect of it on him, which was shared perhaps in less degree by the others, all of them being at the same place all the time.

Next observe closely the contrast packed together in few words by Luke, between what Jesus said finally and

what the others report. It is not that they should catch men as fish are caught to be killed, but as prisoners in war are captured to save them from being killed, the substitution of the military illustration for the piscatorial. Note the next word "henceforth," indicating immediate and permanent movement, contrasted with the indication of delay in the two. Observe also that Luke records no call by Jesus to go with him, except that call which was voiced to them in the surprising situation. Finally the sweeping results; they left "all," not "nets," as in the other Gospels, but all, to follow him "henceforth," in that high understanding up to which he had been leading them since he led them out from the camp of John the Baptist.

If any one claims that the two narratives report two different and distinct occasions, how is he to be refuted? It does not seem to me unreasonable or abnormal, but the reverse, that Jesus brought these men into the comparatively complete understanding of his designs in them and their acquiescence in the same, through two or more, probably more, conversations; the earlier one or ones resulting in their modified response and the last one leading all the way that he desired at that time. This is the method of the wise teacher always, and Jesus was the wisest of all teachers. Consider now harmonizing in this way: Matthew and Mark record the first enlisting interview of this stage, following it with the two miracles in Capernaum. Afterward a second, at least one more, such interview came in the same vicinity, in which the first was carried to completion, but which was not recorded by them but was by Luke in his "colorful" story. This brings the two events into line in the three Gospels in the order of their actual occurrence. And thus Luke stands forth again as the reliable historian, appreciating and emphasizing not only the true order chronologically but also the successive climaxes in it, as the narrative rises from stage to stage of the revelation, as far as it is in view for us. Therefore in the harmony Matthew and Mark should appear in parallel, and Luke should follow them.

The question concerning how much later the final call to the four came after those given by Matthew and Mark may start an investigation leading into something interesting. I have followed this suggestion farther than will be written here; for this is "postscript," carrying a side-light on the main point, the removal of the first sign in Cana, as an obstruction to my scheme in the preceding sections of it. But I venture to add as follows, leaving the reader free to pursue the subject as he may choose:

Matthew places the call to the four immediately after his statement that Jesus began to preach repentance, and follows it immediately with a general view of the extended preaching of Jesus and the responsive coming to him of great multitudes for help from regions beyond Galilee in all directions, and then "the sermon on the mount." Here evidently the writer is making very general statements, with little or no regard for any close chronological connections.

Mark places the call to the four after the statement of the preaching of repentance, as Matthew does, but follows it, not with the general view of Matthew, or anything like it; but with the specific local statement that Jesus went into the synagogue where he delivered the demoniac, adding "and immediately his fame spread abroad throughout all the region of Galilee."

Now consult Luke and compare what he says with the others. He says that, next following the rejection at Nazareth, Jesus went to Capernaum, preached and healed the demoniac, and adds, "Then a rumor about him spread throughout all the surrounding country"; followed immediately by the healing in Peter's house and the great evening work, his retirement, the following of the crowds, to whom he said that he must go to other cities, and "so he continued preaching in the synagogues"—all this with no reference to Peter and with considerable variation of particulars. "And so he continued preaching in the synagogues."

Now it seems to me that when we scrutinize these accounts more fully than is now done, if we take them at their face value, we shall be led toward the conclusion that this call, as Luke has it, is not only different from the others so much as to push it toward a later time, but even farther possibly than I have suggested, even to a time later than that tour of Galilee to which they all refer.

3. Luke's Sources

Where did Luke get his information? Manifestly he undertook the writing of his Gospel with a critical eye. He had the ability and the disposition to scrutinize witnesses and test testimony. He had a clearly defined plan to select the most approved materials and reject the more spurious of the various attempts that had been made in the same field. No doubt he accumulated much that he did not use in this writing. He used just enough to get each point of record clearly into view and then, with a forward insistence that brooked no delay, he moved on to the next thing.

(1) Where did Luke get his stirring story of the great haul of fish and Peter's dramatic participation following it? Certainly not from Mark's Gospel. Possibly he may have heard it from Peter himself in some interview of which we have no record but which we may fairly infer. Or he may have learned it from Mark verbally. Let us imagine, what might easily have been actual, that Mark and Luke were in consultation with Mark's writing before them. Luke was impressed by its meagerness at this point, where it seemed to him to be inadequate. He said so, and Mark replied that that might be, but he in the writing was eager to get on to the next thing and thought that what he had written would be sufficient, and that he knew of a later incident tributary to this one and related it as he remembered it. Then Luke said, to himself at least, that he would preserve it in his record. So it came about that Luke filled this gap as no one has filled several such gaps in Mark's work. I confidently submit that what is here imagined might have been actual consistently with the differences in the styles of thought and expression of these two men.

(2) Turn now our attention back to that uproar in Nazareth which Luke alone reports. Is it not remarkable here, as in the last preceding item, that Luke not only rescues from oblivion an important event but that he records it with what at first sight might seem to be excessive elaboration, but which on our reflection we recognize as of historic value justifying his writing here by the plan which he announced at the outset of his Gospel? Assume that Luke went to Nazareth to get first-hand information in addition to the more or less vague rumors which floated into his ears. At Nazareth he found a considerable company of mature people who were present in that synagogue on that day. He interviewed them carefully, compared their statements, which were based on memories sharply impressed by the extraordinary scene, and out of it all brought credible reproduction of that thrilling affair.

(3) Observe the contrast in credibility of the first miracles which Luke reports in Capernaum and the failure of all miracle in Nazareth. In Capernaum he no doubt found a considerable volume of memories concerning the deeds of Jesus in that earlier period but not of first-class value because of more or less confusion of incidents and varieties of situations and memories. Therefore he used the two found in Mark and thus better authenticated. This he could do consistently on his plan of concentrating attention on the Galilee life of Jesus as a unit, disregard-

ing entirely the departure of Jesus from Galilee intermittently; but in Nazareth the historian worked up the evidence on the ground of a comparatively isolated and positively incisive incident which is historically valuable as introductory to subsequent rejections of Jesus by his own people. Luke would not write his story of the Nazareth outrage as elaborately as he did just for the story. He must have seen in it something historically significant, in a way that was active in the mind of the Master himself, as I have interpreted him in his relation to the officer who met him in Cana.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



48 457 254